6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of rule. The defeat or death of the ruler, as much as lack of constant external pressures, are likely to bring about a sudden disintegration of a political structure based on such foundations. 121 181

Want of human attachments in the society of these steppe marauders might have been brought about by a strong feeling of insecurity which seems to be rooted in the physical as well as in the social environment of these people. Nomadic horse-breeding in the steppes and deserts, abusive dominance and humiliating submission in a despotic family organization, autocratic political system, sharply stratified social structure, and predatory warfare of enemy tribes present constant physical and emotional threats which breed deep fears, anxieties, lack of trust and violent hostilities. These conditions are harmful to the growth of social intimacy and to the development of group identifications and solidarities; they are likely to favor formation of a self-centered personality and to foster an urge for extreme power-seeking and destructive action as a means of personal survival. [154]

Contrasted to the society of these power-oriented and predatory warriors of the steppes, was the group-oriented and anarchic culture of the Old-Slavonic soil cultivators, spreading since remote times over the forest plains and along the river valleys between the upper Volga and the Carpathians. This society represented a stable system of self-contained and autonomous small agricultural communities with equalitarian social and family organization, diffused social power, lack of central political authority, lack of sharp economic or social stratification and lack of coerciveness. Interpersonal and institutional relationships in these communities promoted group intimacy and social cohesion; they discouraged self-seeking, destructive aggressiveness and warlike qualities. But as the nomadic warriors, in the course of their centuries-old invasions, were imposing their rule over this egalitarian and stateless social system, significant changes were taking place in the Old-Slavonic world; these have formed the basis for the formation and the growth of Russian society. [156]

One of the most important innovations consisted of the formation of a ruling class of conquerors whose whole view of life was in complete contrast to the social and political philosophy of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ment of moderation and emotional integration. In the early Slav society, mother's role in all family affairs was very significant. With the growth of the patriarchal family, one of her important duties came to be that of intercessor and of protector against the wrath of the father. In the patriarchal family the mother was not the chief disciplinarian; therefore she did not have to resort to threat, violence, privations, and humiliation as a means of discipline. Her punishments were mild and her main means of control were those of love and reasoning. Her authority and self-respect were therefore not endangered by being close to children and by being on familiar terms with them. She was always available and approachable. The children, therefore, felt much more at ease and free in the presence of their mother than in that of their father.[1]

The mother, if feeling neglected, abused or degraded by a remote and harsh husband, was likely to seek compensation for the lack of love and for wounded self-esteem by being over-protective and over-affectionate in relation to her children, expecting indulgent response from them. The son, if barred in his desire for attachment to his father or if abused and humiliated by him, might feel the more attracted to his mother as a means of emotional outlet and as compensation for feelings of rejection and humiliation.

It is this role of the mother as warm protector and close friend that has been expressed in folk sayings and other products of folk philosophy and imagination. "Fear your father, and respect your mother" says a Russian folk proverb pointing out the sharp contrast in the attitude of a child toward his father and his mother. The folk sayings emphasize also the intimate and tender bond that exists between mother and child and the importance of such close ties for the child. "Without a father the child is half orphan, without a mother a child is a complete orphan"; "Mother's beating does not hurt"; "Mother raises her hand high, but does not strike hard." Because of such close mother-child relationship, it was considered in the popular view of life that mother's influence on the child was in the long run deeper than that of the father. "What mother puts into the child's head, the father will not knock out," the people would say.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Ivan the Terrible]

In this manner popular religious ideas and practices which might have developed as a response to the interpersonal relations in the family and in the Czardom in their own turn tended to perpetuate the existing social and political order, its institutions and practices. There were, however, other aspects of interpersonal relations intrinsic to that social organization which provoked responses that tended not to perpetuate it, but to undermine it and to destroy its very foundations. These important agents of structural change in Russian society will be discussed on the following pages.

11
POWER-SEEKING, MISTRUST, AND DESTRUCTIVE AGGRESSION

I

A CHILD who has been rejected and humiliated by a stern and scornful father, but who has been spoiled by an overindulgent mother might respond to such a situation by developing an exaggerated concern for his own ego, and an extreme intolerance for privations and denials. And in case the mother cannot serve as a satisfactory substitute for rejection by the father, complete detachment from the group, and pity for an abandoned, degraded and suffering self might develop. In such circumstances also a deeply rooted suspicion of others, an unbridled desire for power, and an overwhelming hate and urge for destruction of all those who stand in one's path might take place.

The life histories of a number of Russian rulers and intelligentsia apparently show such an effect of their family environment.[1] Childhood experiences and character traits of Ivan the Terrible, for instance, provide an outstanding example. There is sufficient evidence for the contention that the strange behavior of this Czar was rooted in rejection and in alternating mistreat-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Ivan the Terrible]

[Dobrolyubov]

593 ment and indulgence to which Ivan was exposed as a child. Early
● 154 in his life Ivan was left an orphan. His father died when he was
159 four and he lost his mother four years later. As a child Ivan was reared among crouching servility as well as among arrogance, violence, and contempt. He was greatly pampered on the part of some of his tutors and courtiers, but also often deeply wounded on the part of others. Some of the boyars at the court would annoy him and insult him. They would arrest and threaten with death persons to whom Ivan was attached.

In his own writings, Ivan tells us how much he suffered because he was deprived of his attachments and frustrated in his expectations. It is possible, that it was as a result of such experiences that Ivan developed ideas of rejection, persecution and self-pity, as well as an urge for self-assertion by means of destructive aggression. He sought for himself power which was as overwhelming as that of omnipotent God and asserted himself by means of ruthless violence. "My parents never had a care for me," he claimed. He also said: "In vain I have looked for some man to have pity upon me, but have found no one. Yea, no comforter have I found, but only such as have rewarded me evil for good and hatred for love."[2] He felt emotionally very dependent upon his wife and blamed the courtiers for her early death. He himself explained his assassinations of the boyars on that ground. "Why divided ye me from my wife? Had ye not taken from me my *unitza* (heifer—young wife), never had there been the slayings of the boyars."[3] The old documents say about Ivan
[159] that "He pitieth not men, nor yet yieldeth. Likewise, he loveth not contrary speech, but doth conceive anger against them who do speak it."[4] He is described by his biographers as "self-seeking, opinionated, ferocious and self-willed."

More recent evidence of the effect of rejection-indulgence is given by Dobrolyubov, one of the outstanding Russian intellectual rebels of the second part of the nineteenth century. According to his biographers and according to his own diary, Dobrolyubov was thwarted in his attachment to his father, a clergyman, who was detached, harsh and even brutal in dealings with his son. Dobrolyubov was very close to his mother, but this relation apparently did not compensate for the thwarting and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Dobrolyubov]

humiliating treatment which Dobrolyubov experienced at the hands of his father. As a reaction to such a family situation, Dobrolyubov developed strong needs for emotional attachment and felt very disillusioned and deeply embittered when his need for dependency was frustrated. When he was sixteen years of age this "forerunner of Bolshevism" wrote in his diary:

> No matter how many attachments I had formed in the past, always the evil fate would whisk the beloved being far away from me; and in my soul remains only the sorrowful memory and bitter realization of my despair . . . I could never live without love, without attachment to someone. This has been so ever since I remember myself. But this constant irony of fate, which makes all my hopes and dreams usually crash into dirt, constantly hardens and chills my heart, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that soon it will be both hard and cold as stone.[5]

Later, apparently, Dobrolyubov found an outlet for his repressed hostilities, in his writings in which he tended to emphasize the dark sides of Russian society ("Realm of Darkness"). He joined that group of "Nihilists" who excelled in their philosophy of extreme individualism, who attacked the existing society and devised the ways to destroy "coldbloodedly" its very foundations, including the family. It was in this ideology of "Nihilism" that Russian Anarchism as well as Bolshevism have been rooted.

The demand for unlimited power as a means of compensation for humiliations and deprivations and as a means of satisfying craving for acceptance and support tends to perpetuate a political system which gives one a chance to indulge such needs through relationships of absolute dominance and unconditional submission and through destructive action. Such a social and political structure, in its own turn, tends to reinforce paternal despotism and absolute obedience in the family. In this manner, just as in the society of steppe marauders, power-seeking, mistrust and destructive aggression are perpetuated, become generalized and are manifested in many social relations.

On the folk level desire for power was manifested, for instance, in the customs connected with childbirth. On that occasion the midwife would place the child on a sheepskin coat or furcoat so

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

a self-protection on any sign of hostility a preventive war or feud must be initiated.[14] Hence also craftiness and cunning, readiness to lie and to commit perjury[15] and a general wiliness and wariness might easily develop.[16] When a society is to a large extent governmentalized and regimented, such traits are reinforced because in such conditions the feeling of insecurity and lack of trust favor ruthless domineering and coercive submission on all levels of social organization.

In circumstances where power-seeking, extreme self-concern and lack of mutual trust prevail there is a readiness of many people to spy on one another and to inform. There is also an inclination to calumniate[1] as a means of revenge and personal malice.

Destructive aggressiveness and feeling of insecurity, as well as need for succor, may explain the passion for hazardous games and intoxicating drink, and the inclination toward lechery. That liquor is used as a compensatory device which provides a feeling of power and security as contrasted to a reality in which one is cowed into submission is well expressed in folk philosophy. According to a proverb, "When the peasant is drunk, he feels equal to a nobleman; when he is sober he is afraid even of a pig."[17] Hence, in a society in which people find themselves subdued, degraded, and oppressed and where their needs for attachment and acceptance are thwarted, a safe way to rebel against such conditions or to find a convenient substitute may be in drunkenness and debauchery. The early Church documents, as well as the recent evidence, point to the perseverance of such practices:

> Numerous are the sermons devoted to invectives against drunkenness and the pagan character of banquets . . . This wild debauch of popular feasts was preserved until the twentieth century, with the same scenes of drunken fighting and killing as are depicted in this document of the thirteenth century. Orgiasm . . . unrestrained emotional outbursts, stimulated by alcohol, dancing, fighting, or sex, always has been an outstanding feature of Russian temperament.[18]

[1] [Sic -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Herzen]
[Sophia Perovskaya]

with all his fellow creatures . . . I felt intense pity for the old man, but I could do nothing—he was inaccessible.[2]

The liberalizing influences which were penetrating Russia from the West reinforced urges of revolt against despotism as well as feelings of identification with suffering masses. By the second part of the nineteenth century the reaction against the tyrannical family environment and oppressing political system took often an extreme form. It is common knowledge that many Russian terrorists and assassins of the second part of the nineteenth century grew up exposed to constant family tensions and personal humiliations, and sought total destruction of society. Others were inclined to identify themselves with all who were abused. Thus we find the urge for destruction and identification with suffering as fundamental aspects of the ideology of Russian revolutionary movements. For instance, Kropotkin, the outstanding Russian Anarchist directly related his revolutionary activities to his identification with all those who were persecuted. He appealed to all who were exposed to maltreatment to rise against their oppressors:

Ay, all of us together, we who suffer and are insulted daily, we are a multitude whom no man can number. We are the ocean that can embrace and swallow up all else. When we have but the will to do it, that very moment will justice be done; that very instant the tyrants of the earth shall bite the dust.[3]

Or take, for instance, Sophia Perovskaya, one of the plotters in the assassination of Czar Alexander II. According to her biographers her father was a willful despot "such as the patriarchal system alone could have produced," and her mother, "constantly humiliated and insulted," remained at home to protect the children. Thus, in her own family Perovskaya learned to hate oppression and developed her love for the oppressed and weak. For her mother, one of the down-trodden, she had a love "bordering upon adoration."[4] Catherine Breshkovskaya, another outstanding Russian revolutionary, who became known as the "little grandmother of the Russian revolution," tells us in her reminiscences and letters how her childhood experiences affected her feelings, thoughts, and actions throughout her life:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Catherine Breshkovskaya]
[Bakunin]

154 159 668 How many times, stupefied and shocked, I have been the witness of such humiliating, degrading, excruciating things! How many times I have thrown myself at my father's feet to implore pardon for a so-called culprit, whose only fault, perhaps, was to have fallen asleep while herding the sheep! How many times I have been indignant to see how hundreds of peasants would be kept waiting in the courtyard, bare-headed and shivering with cold, waiting for the master to appear, after making them wait all day, would send them off without a word, so taken up was he with gambling at cards with other lords, who in their turn were making their coachmen wait on the carriage box till their hands were frozen! These things tormented my childish mind, and pursued me even into my bed, where I would lie awake for hours, unable to sleep for thinking of all the horrors about me. Child as I was, I could not understand why these honest folk should bear the entire burden of work and of taxes. I saw that my father, good though he was, put much more heart into looking after his own interests than the interests of his serfs, and I was shocked at the inequality between the rich and the poor. From the age of eight, how to find justice was the question that troubled me.[5]

538 771 Identification with suffering is outstanding in the literary works of Dostoyevsky. Influenced by religious feelings, he considered his own sufferings as a blessing. He identified Russia with crucified Christ and regarded the sufferings of the Russian people as a means by which the wrongs of all mankind will be expiated so that a new and better order will prevail on the earth: "All men will be holy and love one another, and there will be no more rich nor poor, no exulted nor humbled, but all will be as the children of God, and the true Kingdom of Christ will come."[6]

II

593 159 668 Not in all families of Russian intelligentsia was the situation alike. There were families in which harmonious relations prevailed. There were also families in which reaction developed not against the despotism of the father but against the tyranny of the mother. Bakunin, for instance, describes his mother as "a vain, egotistical woman and none of her children loved her."[7] According to Carr, Bakunin "attributed his passion for destruction to the influence of his mother, whose despotic character

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

wanted to suffer, wanted persecution."[18] A number of heroes in Dostoyevsky's novels show the same urge.

Undoubtedly such feelings contributed to that tone of fanaticism and that readiness for self-sacrifice which was characteristic of many Russian revolutionaries and conspirators of pre-Soviet days and which gave a special vigor and intensity to their activities. Such extremes in emotional reactions were supported also by another trait in these people, that of emotional instability.

13
EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY

I

FEAR and awe (*strakh*), submission (*povinovenie*), and sense of guilt (*sovest*) are rooted in the structure of the Great-Russian society and are supported by its traditions. But so is compassion (*zhalost*), humility (*smirenie*), demand for truth and justice (*pravda*) and for egalitarian acceptance, as well as revolt and terror (*ustrashenie*), lack of trust and urge to destroy (*unichtozhenie*). It is the propensity to experience such contrasting sentiments that causes behavior which is alternatively bent in opposite directions. A person's behavior which has been conditioned by an environment which fosters such feelings and attitudes might show a lack of sense of moderation and a tendency toward extremes in responses to his social milieu.

It is such unbalanced peculiarities of behavior that have drawn the attention of many students and observers of Russian society.[1] A tendency toward diametrically opposite extremes, and frequent alternation between these poles has been often noticed. Kindliness and gentleness have alternated with lack of consideration, excessive severity, brutality and cruelty. Rebelliousness has been followed by resignation. Periods of feverish energy and confidence have been superseded by spells of inertia, languor and despair. Extremes in feasting have alternated with extremes in fasting. Tyrannical rule had its counterpart in demands for

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

absolute and unconditional liberty and denial of any laws, conventions or obligations.[2] Ideologies which sought universal salvation and identification with Christ's teaching (Dissent, Slavophilism) had their counterparts in the ideologies which demanded universal destruction and identification with anti-Christ (Nihilism, Terrorism).[3]

Among the intelligentsia a lack of a sense for methodical work, and lack of initiative were combined with preoccupation concerning grandiose and utopian plans on a world scale. There was a noticeable lack of preparation for these programs and a tendency to consider that having made plans was equal to their fulfillment. Such traits were so striking among some intelligentsia that they were given a special name (*Oblomovshtina*).[4]

It is known that a number of outstanding Russian intellectuals have shown a remarkable lack of emotional balance in their behavior. These would often move from one ideological camp into that of their bitter opponents. In ideological controversies no tolerance was shown for the opposite point of view. There was a tendency to treat all in the opposite camp as enemies. "Who is not with us is against us," was the principle applied in theory and practice. Some outstanding Russian intellectuals themselves admitted such traits in their character. Dostoyevsky, for instance, analyzing his own feelings stated: "In all things I go to the uttermost extremes; my life long I have never been acquainted with moderation." Not unlike this self-analysis of Dostoyevsky was that of Bakunin. In his "Confession to the Czar" he said: "There was in my character a radical defect: love for the fantastic, for out-of-the-way, unheard of adventures, for undertakings which open up an infinite horizon and whose end no man can foresee."[5]

According to General Golovine among the army officers there was a "tendency to drunkenness, churlishness and tyranny toward their subordinates," but there were also "many heroes among these negative types," and often a "regular officer showed such readiness to sacrifice himself that his superiors were forced to restrain his excessive ardor."[6] Lack of balance and stability was also reflected in the differences between military units. Often "next to a first class regiment there was another completely worthless."[7]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his power over others, so unshakable is his belief in his own sovereignty.... There is tremendous strength in *Boris Godunov*, the part I would sooner play than any of the others of my repertory. Here again the Russian temperament is overwhelmingly manifest in the seditious license of the boyars, as it is in the boundless autocracy of Ivan the Terrible. It appears also in the lawlessness and drunkenness of Prince Galitski, one of the chief characters of Borodin's admirable opera *Prince Igor*. Galitski's excesses are as extreme as his cynicism.[9]

Some observers of Great-Russian music find in it traits similar to those of Great-Russian belles-lettres. According to Leroy-Beaulieu the Great-Russian music shows an "alternation between extreme emotionality and extreme peacefulness."[10] And according to General Golovine this music is a "combination of the vague and salient softness and harshness of sound, deep sorrow and uncontrolled gaiety, dreams and drama, restlessness and calm ..."[11] Golovine specifically referred to the music of Glinka, Chaikovsky, Borodin, Rimsky-Korsakoff, and Rachmaninoff.

Extremes of self-aggrandizement followed by self-maceration, murder followed by tears, is noticeable also in the Russian folk psychology. The Great-Russian folk songs, for instance, are often full of cruelty, but are also heart-breaking and plaintive, full of sadness, melancholy and tragedy, sung in minor key. In folk tales and folk songs about Stenka Razin, this robber-bandit is represented both as magnanimous and cruel, as savage and pitiful. He revolted against those in authority, but rallied the poor and rebellious beneath his banner. At the same time he himself showed traits of barbarism and of self-laceration. One of the popular Russian folk songs, tells us, for instance, how once Stenka, "drunk with wine and mirth together," lifted the Persian Princess, his beloved "new-vow bride," over the side of his barque and flung her "forth into the hungry deep" of the Volga, as "a gift from a Cossack of the Don." Stenka acted in such a violent manner because some of his comrades had scornfully reproached him that in his affection to his bride he behaved like a *baba* (woman).

II

A number of interpretations are offered for such behavior.[12] Most of these explanations are either "geografic" or "cultural-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

diffusionist" in their general approach. Thus a number of writers attribute the ambivalent traits in Russian behavior to the influence of climate. The struggle with hostile forces of nature, say these people, has developed in the Russian man qualities of tenacity, energy, and strength; but at the same time the insuperable forces of nature have developed qualities of patience, resignation, and meekness. The former has developed hardness of character by the very bitterness of the struggle; the latter has taught him to sympathize with the afflicted and desolate.[13]

Other geographic theories point out not only the extremes in climate, but the contrasting nature of the soil as well, as a means to explain Russian behavior and Russia's life and history which are full of contrasts and contradictions. Russia's forest and marshy area is contrasted to the steppe regions as the basic foundations on which Russian society has grown.[14]

There are other students of Russia who tend to explain unbalanced traits in the Russian man on the ground of conflicting Asiatic and European cultural influences, to which Russia has been subjected throughout many centuries of its formation. This view is still shared by many. It had been advanced by a number of Russian intellectuals, among them Leo Tolstoy:

> One *Rus* has its roots in a universal, or at least in European culture. In this *Rus* the ideas of goodness, honor and freedom are understood as in the West. But there is another *Rus:* the *Rus* of the dark forests, the *Rus* of the Taiga, the animal Russia, the fanatic Russia, the Mongol-Tartar Russia. This last Russia made despotism and fanaticism its ideal. . . . Kiev *Rus* was a part of Europe, Moscow long remained negation of Europe.[15]

It would be difficult however to explain ambivalence in the behavior of individuals and peoples exclusively on the basis of such generalized influences of East and West, extremes in climate, and contrasts between forests and steppes. The circumstances which become significant as agents in personality formation have to be felt directly or indirectly on a number of levels of interpersonal and institutional relationships. Among these one of the more effective influences which shape and mold the personality of man seems to be the family environment.

Some Russian intellectual leaders and men of letters, such as

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Some Russian intellectual leaders and men of letters, such as Dobrolyubov, Ostrovsky, Herzen and Kropotkin were very much impressed by the effect which Russian family atmosphere had in shaping the personality of the Russian people, especially the intelligentsia. Herzen pointed out that in a family in which there was "much to hate and despise, and almost nothing to love and to respect," the psychological development was not full, but warped. In a similar manner Kropotkin explains that people who are brought up in families in which the personal relationships between children and their parents are based not on love and mutual respect but on fear and unconditional submission become both domineering and servile, as well as rebellious:

> A child's spirit is weak. It is so easy to coerce it by fear . . . They make the child timid, and they talk to him of the torments of hell. They conjur up before him the sufferings of the condemned, and vengeance of an implacable God . . . and by that habit of submission the thought of the next generation attains this religious twist, which is at once servile and authoritative; for authority and servility walk ever hand in hand. . . . Then the degradation of the ruler and of the judges, of the clergy and of the more or less comfortable classes becomes so revolting that the pendulum begins to swing the other way.[16]

The family environment, however, is itself an integral part of the society to which it belongs and is therefore interacting with it. Hence an understanding of the structure of the whole society, of the view of life, traditional culture and general orientation of its various strata, of the configuration of its interpersonal, institutional and power relationships is necessary in order to explain personality formation and peculiarities of behavior of a people.[17] It is in such a total context that also the direct and the indirect influences of physical environment or of any other "external" pressures might be correctly appraised.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

large part of them were disfranchised as well, because in municipal self-government and in district and provincial assemblies even persons holding university degrees, if they did not own a sufficient amount of property, were devoid of the right of suffrage.[4] And it was this underprivileged group of declassee nobility, of priests' sons, of former clerics, of sons and daughters of lower government employees, of unemployed professionals, of students and of former students who never had a chance to finish their studies, that became known as the *raznochintsy*.

The raznochintsy intelligentsia tended to lead a bohemian life and to engage in literary activities and journalism. But these vocations were greatly limited because of strict censorship laws. When the bar was established some raznochintsy practiced law as barristers, though they were very restricted in their activities because of traditional extra legal practices of the police. When under local self-administration (*Zemstvo*), a health, educational, and economic program for the improvement of rural areas was developed, a number of raznochintsy were employed by the Zemstvo as physicians, veterinarians, agronomists, teachers and bookkeepers. At the same time, their traditions and training, and especially their ambitions and expectations had conditioned the raznochintsy for intellectual pursuits and political leadership, not for routine administrative work or for business promotion and enterprise.

In such a situation the deeply rooted feeling of rejection which had been developed on the family level was greatly magnified.[5] Accordingly, self-centeredness, power-seeking, lack of trust, destructive aggression, as well as identification with suffering which were developed on the family level were heightened in these circumstances and found expression in ideologies which manifested extreme hostility and an urge for universal destruction. Many of these young rebels, for instance, denied all existing social institutions, conventions and restrictions, and demanded their total obliteration.

This ideology of extreme negation and destruction ("Nihilism") manifested, perhaps, the feelings of utter despair of the ambitious and self-seeking raznochintsy who felt impotent before the God-like power of the Czar and his omnipotent police.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Thwarted in their drive for power and political leadership, these young men and women gave vent to their feelings of deprivation in phantasies and plans of destruction and death.

Much of the sadness, tragic sarcasm, morbidity and preoccupation with death and suffering which dominated Russian literature in the second part of the nineteenth century reflects such moods of despair. The predominance of social and political themes in the literary creations of these people and the insistence of literary critics of those days on literary "realism," that is, that a work of art should be judged not by artistic and esthetic criteria but by its portrayal of existing life and its faithfulness to reality, especially the brutal and dark reality, manifested the same feelings.

Pisarev, describing this psychological reaction of impotence and the urge for destruction before seemingly uncontrollable forces, stated that when men "find it impossible to transform life, their anger at their own impotence makes itself felt in the sphere of thought, where the destructive work of criticism proceeds unceasingly."[6] That the basic drive behind this urge for negation and destruction was extreme self-seeking is witnessed by some other ideas of the same writer. "Every living being," said Pisarev, "is for himself the center and the meaning of the universe . . . his personal joys, vexations, aspirations, and cares, are more important than universal revolutions. . . ."

Starting with such premises, some of the Nihilists refused to recognize any regulation, any moral law, any principle, whether above, external, or within a person as being "absolute." The result was preaching of extreme materialism and individualism, and denial of all "absolute" ethics, of duty and of responsibility, of ideals and of social values.

II

In the meantime, however, the effects of European revolutions of 1848 and the defeats of the Russian armies in the Crimean War (1854–1856) led some of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia to the belief that the Czarist system was not as invulnerable as generally accepted. These people proposed direct and organized action against the Czarist regime in order to raze it to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

sary to know how to hate them. The Anarchists therefore undertook to find ways by which extreme hatred could best be promoted. This, they said, should be done first by arousing passionate and uncompromising love for equality and freedom and becoming ready to suffer and to sacrifice oneself for these ideas; then by instilling burning hatred and urge of destruction of those who stand in the path of these objectives. "The terrorist," said Stepniak, "is noble, terrible, irresistibly fascinating for he combines in himself two sublimities of human grandeur: the martyr and the hero."[11] Such a revolutionary will "not hesitate to destroy any position, any place, or any man in this world. He must hate everyone and everything with an equal hatred."[12]

Ambivalence of hatred and love and justification of violence for the sake of salvation of others had their roots in the family and were reinforced by conditions in the society at large. Identification with suffering, guilt feelings, desire for martyrdom and self destruction had the same roots and reinforcements. On the ideological level of Anarchism these feelings and attitudes were formulated into principles of thought and action:

> . . . we do not forego our own capacity to love what seems to us good and to hate what seems to us bad. Love and hate, for only those who know how to hate know how to love . . . We only ask one thing, e.c. to eliminate all that impedes the free development of those two feelings in the present society, all that perverts our judgment: the state, the church, exploitation; judges, priests, government, exploiters . . .[13]

But since the primary sources of this ideology and conduct were feelings of rejection, hate and killing took the upper hand over love. Accordingly the Anarchists demanded severance of the relations with the rest of the society and complete dedication to destruction. "The revolutionary has broken all ties with society." He "should have no . . . attachments, no property and no name. All these must be wholly absorbed in the single thought and the single passion for revolution."[14]

Detachment from the rest of the society promoted self-pity and therefore reinforced destructive aggressiveness both against the others and against the self. Renouncement of all ethical, moral or other consideration in dealing with adversaries, pitiless-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ness and ruthlessness both toward themselves and toward those who were not with them became in this manner an integral part of the revolutionary movement in Russia.[15] On such foundations a "science of merciless destruction" was developed:

> The revolutionary is wholly dedicated. He must show no mercy to the State or towards the civilized classes of society; nor does he ask for mercy for himself. Between him and society there is waged a mortal war declared or concealed, a relentless and irreconcilable fight to the death. He must accustom himself to torture.
>
> Tyrannical towards himself, the revolutionary must be tyrannical towards others. All the emotions that move human beings, all the soft and enervating feelings of kinship, love, friendship, gratitude and honor, must give way to a cold and single-minded passion for revolution. For him there exists only one pleasure, one consolation, one reward, one satisfaction—the success of the revolution. Night and day he must have but one thought, but one aim—merciless destruction. Coldly, relentlessly, he pursues his aim, and he must be prepared to perish himself, as he must be prepared to destroy with his own hands those who stand in his way.[16]

A revolutionary organization engaged in a life and death struggle with the rest of society precluded any internal disagreement. Bakunin, for instance, conceived a secret organization with a disciplined membership, a system of strict control of its members, and a rigidly centralized authority vested in one man only. Bakunin's secret society was to consist of three separate and independent groups which would function under different names and would be unacquainted with one another. Each one of these three groups was to operate in a different stratum of society. But each group was to be subject to a rigid hierarchy of power and each member of the group subjected to unconditional obedience to his superiors.

These secret societies were to be limited to a small number of people and were to include, as far as possible, only able, experienced, energetic, and influential men, professional conspirators, who, in strict obedience to a central control would lead the masses. All three secret societies were to be coordinated by a central committee which would have consisted of Bakunin and of three or four other members selected by him. Bakunin wanted

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

623 a few kulaks were often able to force the commune members into unanimous decision by means of threats or bribing. And there was no appeal against such decisions.

565 621 154 In such circumstances many land communes tended to lose their former equalitarian and protective aspects and the peasants came to fear the mir and to feel an awe before it as much as they had a fear and awe before God and the Czar or before a stern and distant father. They feared the overwhelming power of the mir, the finality of its decision, and the lack of redress against its will They tended to identify the mir's final power with that of Almighty God. "There is no court for the mir, one God is its judge," they would say. Feeling helpless in the front of such an [156] uncontrollable power, there seemed to be nothing else for the peasants to do but to submit to its will. "One cannot argue with the mir"; "Mir will stand for itself, you cannot go against it" they would say. And since there was no other way out for one but to be a part of such an overwhelming and capricious institution the most expedient way of behavior for him was to accept it and to do as the others do. "Although bad, you cannot do without it"; "If you have to live with wolves you might as well howl as they do."[11]

621 625 156 The mir and police were empowered to interfere not only in the system of planting, sowing, and harvesting, but in family and personal affairs as well. The problems of paternal authority and filial duties, the relations between husband and wife, and between in-laws, the questions of inheritance, military conscription, and general behavior, all were within the grasp of these village authorities.[12] Just as in his own family, the rank-and-file individual was completely lost in his village commune. A rank-and-file man had the right to participate in the debates and was expected to vote unanimously for the regulations which restricted his personal and his economic freedom. He who dared to object was unprotected against the despotism and arbitrariness either of the ruling minority or of an incited mob. Thus the feelings of complete dependence upon superior powers prevailed in the community.

241 In addition, poor quality of land, lack of sufficient moisture, long and hard winters, many years of military service, low

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

standards of formal education, low level of agricultural technology, undeveloped means of transportation and too many idle days handicapped the advance of agriculture. In such circumstances the peasants did not even produce sufficient food to nourish themselves, much less a surplus to exchange for manufactured products. As a consequence the peasants were exposed to periodical famines during which many died of starvation.

Periodical epidemics of cholera, typhus, small pox, and other diseases took a toll as high as famines. A low degree of personal hygiene in crowded living conditions also increased the death rate. In addition there was a great dearth of doctors, nurses and hospitals, and no measures of preventive medicine. Equally ruinous were the periodical cattle epidemics due to primitive techniques of cattle raising. One should add to these misfortunes the figure of more than one hundred thousand peasant homes destroyed each summer by fires, many of them the result of arson. And if one considers the widely spread robbery, theft and murder that went undetected and unpunished, one gets an idea of the distressing personal and social conditions in which the Russian peasant lived. It was in such circumstances, left entirely to his own resources, that he developed an ideological, emotional and symbolical world of his own.

17
THE ATTITUDES OF THE PEASANTRY

I

STUNNED by the magnitude of the inimical and arbitrary social and physical forces which surrounded him and completely controlled his life, the Great-Russian peasant felt impotent and helpless. In the family circle if he had to be submissive and he was exposed to arbitrariness of the elder, he also might have enjoyed a certain degree of protection and succor.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Outside the family, however, this system of social relationships tended to lose its protection-dependence character and to emphasize domineering-subservience attitudes in complete contrast to the traditions of and his yearning for an equalitarian and protective folk community that had existed in the past.

In such circumstances his sense of rejection and his demand for acceptance which he might have experienced in the family were reinforced and magnified, affecting his whole view of life, his attitudes toward the world around him and his image of the universe. He was convinced that there was no justice in the world and that there was nobody to whom he could appeal for redress. "Injustice and untruth rule the world"; "Injustice and untruth started with the world and will end with the world," he would say.[1]

In such circumstances the peasant was inclined to see the wrathful, the revengeful, and the implacable aspect of God, especially since such image of a Christian God had support in the teachings of the Russian Orthodoxy. Accordingly the peasant visioned the saints who surrounded the Old Man as quarrelling among themselves and bragging about their strength and achievements and as being vindictive, cheating, and playing tricks on one another.[2] Since the peasant pictured Christ as being only the son of a wrathful Father, he could not depend upon him according to the Russian view of patriarchal family relationships. The Russian peasant therefore had a "sympathetic but detached view of Christ."[3]

The peasant's feeling of rejection in regard to God was manifested in his lack of assurance as to the help he could expect from Him. God, to whom he prayed, seldom interfered on his behalf against earthly authorities. And though "All power was from God," the peasant knew that "God gives power to whom he wants to." The peasant was therefore at times openly resentful of God's neglect. "God neither lets you live nor die," he would say. In his despair he was inclined to believe that there were other forces, beside God, which ruled the universe, such as the Devil who was looked upon as "the junior brother of God and his carpenter in the creation of the universe."[4] And, not unlike Asiatic steppe herders who lived in similar circumstances, the

1 [i.e. the peasant family of Tsarist days -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

that "If all laws perished the people would live in truth and justice."[7]

The peasant realized that there was sharp differentiation in economic status in his society as well as in his own local community. But what he especially resented was that the men of wealth took advantage of their position to oppress the weak; and that the poor had to be utterly submissive and subservient to the well-to-do. "The one who is better off has long hands," the peasants would say, meaning that the men of wealth had control over others. And he would compare the arbitrariness of the man of power with the craftsman who handles his material according to his will. "The master is like the carpenter: he cuts the way it pleases him." He would also say that the rich man has all the space he wants "as much as the pike in the water," but as "for the poor there is nowhere any room." He resented the fact that though "Poverty was not sin, yet the people laughed at it." He also objected that the poor were forced to repress their real feelings and cringe before the rich. "The poor are angry at the rich, yet they find themselves in their trail with cap in hand," he would complain.[8]

The peasant therefore grew distrustful and resentful of everyone who was in one way or other above him. He could not depend much upon God and Czar, and he mistrusted the bureaucrats, the landlords, the priests, the judges, the police, and even the better-off people of his own strata. He was particularly distrustful of cities and city folk, of Moscow and Moscovites especially. From ancient times he looked upon Moscow, the seat of the Czar's government, as heartless and deceitful, and as the source of most of his troubles. "In Moscow," he thought, "you find everything except own father and mother." He also considered that his capital city was so corrupted that, "If you go to Moscow you must take there your last penny."

The peasant therefore lived in an environment in which he felt deserted by the powers of heaven and oppressed by their representatives on earth. He therefore felt unprotected, isolated, friendless, lonely, and insecure. His idea was that both God and man were against him. "If God attacks you, good people will attack you too," he would complain.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

The peasant therefore appraised the social environment in which he lived as dominated by powerful destructive forces which were capricious, neglectful and inimical but upon which he was completely dependent for his life and livelihood. He strongly resented these powers and wished he could destroy them, but felt helpless before them. He therefore projected his feelings of helplessness as well as his destructive urges into the supernatural world and proceeded to inhabit that world with all-powerful, arbitrary, and vicious beings which sought the annihilation of man, and of the earth.

II

On the family level in similar circumstances, two contrasting tendencies, that of complete submission to the parental power and that of rebellion against it are likely to be formed. In a like manner submission and rebellion characterized the behavior of the Russian peasantry on the local community level. The peasant was inclined to appear servile and docile toward all authorities. He would address every one of his superiors as "Father" (*batyushka*). He would bow low (*klanyatsya v poyas*) or in twain (*klanyatsya v nogi*) before them. Before the Czar he would prostrate himself (*chelobitye*) and if the Czar was passing by he would fall on his knees and cross himself. All he could hope for was that by offering unconditional obedience or by propitiating the powers that be, he would be spared. And if all this appeasing of the authorities were in vain he would refrain from revolt as long as he realized that he was utterly helpless and without support in the front of overwhelming powers. In such circumstances he tended to become completely resigned and fatalistic. He might arrive at the conclusion that "You cannot run away from fate, not even on horse-back," and that "Unto each man happens what was decreed at his birth."[9]

With such a frame of mind the Russian peasant was ready to accept great suffering without much complaint. "Misfortune is like the ocean: neither you can swim across it nor can you draw it out," he would say. "And who is it that was not visited by misfortune and misery?" he would ask. Therefore since "You cannot escape misery," "Do not struggle with misery, but suffer"

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

(*S bedoyu ne perekoryaisya, terpi!*). And then if life is all suffering, why be afraid of death, he would ask himself. "Be afraid to live, do not be afraid to die! To live is more terrible than to die"; "We do not rejoice in life, but in death."[10]

Identification with suffering and preoccupation with death which has been conditioned by family experiences and reinforced on the community level led the Russian peasants to practice long and hard fasts, and to undertake difficult pilgrimages to far off places of worship. "There is only one salvation, fast and prayer"; "We don't live on bread, but on prayer" they would say. Long and hard fasting and prayer of the Great-Russian peasants were not only manifestations of his identification with suffering and his feeling of helplessness and complete dependency upon superior forces, but were perhaps also expressions of his tendency to completely retire from an unsatisfactory and an unhappy world.

The extremes of this suffering and withdrawal from the world were reached by anchorites who sought complete solitude in wild deserts "far away from men," and by those hermits who lived self-buried in the catacombs, away not only from man, but also from the light of day. Such people enjoyed among the peasants the fame of saints and were believed to possess miraculous powers. Many peasants would make vows of pilgrimage to places where such people lived self-buried, isolated and withdrawn from all human contact.

III

The peasant's complete submission to unpredictable and arbitrary forces was enhanced because of the lack of solidarity among the peasants themselves. After the peasant had been subjected to arbitrary regimentation and to permanent policing on the part of the authorities, he began to lose faith not only in the authorities but in his fellow peasants as well. Thus mistrust and suspiciousness rooted in patriarchal relations were heightened. In such circumstances the peasant became increasingly distrustful of his neighbors, tended to withdraw within his own family and to become himself ready to spy on others.[11]

In such conditions when isolated, helpless and self-oriented,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Building on the traditional role of the Father in the Russian family the Party portrays the Party Leader as a strict and distant but also watchful and solicitous man who takes good care of his family. Following the traditional image of God and of the Father, the Party Leader is pictured as being benevolent toward those who submit to him unconditionally, but as being wrathful and merciless toward his foes and all those who disobey. And just like the members of the Great-Russian family, the Soviet people are expected to show "filial gratitude" to their Elder for his care and vigilance. Hence the supreme Party Leader is addressed as "our own father" (*rodnoy otets*), teacher (*uchitel*), leader (*vozhd*), friend (*drug*), and feeder (*kormilets*). Articles and letters of gratitude published daily in the Soviet press invariably mention his fatherly solicitude (*otecheskaya zabota*), his wise (*mudry*) plan and his genius (*geny*). Without fail they thank him ardently (*goryachee spasibo*) for what he has done for the well-being (*blago*), happiness (*schastie*), and world mightiness of the Soviet state (*velichaishaya derzhava mira*). On the occasion of the Leader's birthday numerous songs and musical compositions include titles which convey the idea of dependence upon and filial gratitude to an All-Powerful and All-Wise Vozhd.

It is expected that such identifications will reinforce in the Soviet people the feeling of guilt and make them redouble their efforts in building and supporting the Soviet system. Thus in the letters which various institutions, organizations and associations write to Vozhd, pledges are given to fulfill and overfulfill their quotas and to improve quality of products in gratitude for his unceasing "paternal care" and solicitude. And if they have failed, stayed behind, or have not come up to the expectations of their "father and teacher," they admit their guilt and promise to spare no efforts to improve, and thus arrest his wrath and rejection.[39] Not only lowly and humble folk from the bottom of the Soviet social pyramid, but men and women on the lofty peaks of Soviet arts and sciences, write such letters to Stalin in the same tone of religious reverence and humility, that strongly remind one both of the servility of Czarist official classes and of the prayers to an All-Mighty and wrathful God in the Russian Orthodox Church.

The ruling hierarchy realizes, however, that deification of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Many observers of Soviet society have noticed that in this constant struggle for power, and sometimes in order to save their very lives, Soviet officials and intellectuals must be ready not only to inform on each other, but also to "throw mud" at the closest associates and friends as soon as these happen to fall in disgrace.[1] Denunciation of a friend is often "the best way out of a hole," they say. Many "pretend to deny and to disown those who fall in disgrace" or, frightened, "join in verbal lynching to protect themselves." There is a "malignant joy regarding a comrade's mistakes . . . exaggeration of mistakes."[2] They "rush to kick a man who is already down, to push him over the precipice." In such conditions "Friendship is strained with blood and betrayal; it is an object of fear and suspicion."[3] Even members of one's own family might be repudiated under such pressure.[4] At the same time the need for cringing before one's superiors is often compensated by arrogance, capriciousness, arbitrariness, insulting and humiliating treatment of his subordinates or of all unprotected.[5]

The sense of guilt, insecurity, and feelings of humiliation which develop in such circumstances are magnified by means of social isolation. This isolation is manifold in the Soviet society, especially in the upper ruling strata. Intimate personal contact and unfettered social and intellectual intercourse is officially frowned upon and is therefore very limited among the Party, Army, government and managerial hierarchies. Intimate fraternization with associates is looked upon with great suspicion in a society whose ruling minority maintains itself in power by means of planned social divisions and mistrusts. Said Stalin: ". . . such family conditions create a favorable environment for the nurture of reptiles, not Bolsheviks."[6]

Real risks are involved in any free discourse in a society which is infested with watchdogs and informers and in which many are inclined to seek self-advance in the ruin of others. In the upper strata besides fear, suspicion and need for extreme caution, there is lack of intimate contact also because of sharp differentiation in rank. For the same reasons intercourse between the educated and non-educated strata has to be kept to a minimum.

There is also a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling class

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

newspapers, books, and pamphlets, some of which were printed abroad and circulated freely though often clandestinely among the leading circles of the Empire.

The ruling circles of the Bolshevik Party themselves were always aware that without criticism intellectual stagnation, lack of creative initiative, and bureaucratism would set in. But they could not afford to allow complete freedom of thought and of expression which might eventually undermine their own power. As a result the Bolsheviks introduced a system of "criticism and self-criticism," known as *samokritika*.

According to this practice it is the duty of every Soviet subject to criticize his own work and the work of others in his shop or office as a means of stimulating alertness, initiative, and hard work, and as a way to correct errors. But among the officials who closely watch each other's activities, each hoping to rise on the cadaver of the other, samokritika is often used as a means of intrigue and ruin in jockeying and struggling for ranks, positions, and power. Samokritika therefore has developed into a weapon employed to detect the ideological deviations and diversions and to criticize any lack of sufficiently positive attitude toward the "Party line." In this manner "self-criticism" in the Soviet Union has become another instrument of regimentation and means to increase conformity.

Samokritika is also employed by the ruling circles to manipulate hostilities generated by the Soviet system and to direct them away from themselves and against the managers and bureaucrats located mostly on the lower levels of the Soviet social pyramid. These people conveniently function as scapegoats. It is such people who, together with a sprinkling from the higher echelons, are periodically offered as sacrifice and "purged" or "liquidated." Samokritika is therefore employed also as a check against abuses of power, though mostly on the local level.

In an atmosphere of complete dependence upon and subordination to an overwhelming and infallible power which instils fear and awe, the slightest deviation from the line of thought and emotions as laid down by that distant and inscrutable force might easily provoke anxieties, and a strong sense of guilt. In circumstances in which one feels isolated and without support,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

one's helplessness, feeling of rejection, and dependence upon the controlling power is especially keenly felt. In such conditions even a slight deviation might provoke a feeling of guilt, need for self-punishment and suffering; it might call for public self-humiliation, confession of errors and pledges to repent and to correct the wrong done, especially when such practices are supported by the inherited traditions. There is therefore a certain degree of truth in the assertion of the Bolsheviks, that "Criticism and self-criticism is a great driving force in the development of Soviet society."[10]

II

In a "prison and barracks" society privileges of power and ideas of grandeur do not sufficiently compensate for lack of acceptance, isolation, humiliations, feelings of insecurity, and sense of inferiority and rejection. In an atmosphere of suspicion, intrigue, degradation, and lack of intimate personal and intellectual contact and of social support, anxieties, fears, extreme self-concern, and deep antagonisms easily flourish. Such a situation tends to magnify feelings of destructive aggression developed on the family level and is therefore likely to become overcharged with extreme hostilities and hatreds; it is likely to become full of potential explosiveness which may be directed against the ruling class itself unless convenient channels for discharge of aggressiveness are found.

In a society in which overt expressions of emotional behavior are under the control of a ruling clique, accumulating aggressions are readily directed against internal and external "enemies" of the regime, be they real or invented for the occasion. In this manner the feeling of hostility against the regime might be redirected against its opponents. It is therefore in the interest of survival of the ruling faction in such a society to cultivate hatred and destruction of the "enemy" by all means of public pressure, propaganda, agitation, education, as well as lawmaking.

These are the reasons why attitudes of extreme animosity against the "enemies of the Soviet Motherland" are propagated in the Soviet daily press and in the school textbooks. Stirring hatreds is one of the main tasks of Party agitators.[11] Accordingly